

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application.¹ By this Amendment, claims 4, 11, 18 and 23 have been amended and claims 8, 9, 15, 16 and 26 have been cancelled. The amended claims include subject matter from the rejected claims and are also supported by the specification at, for example, page 12. Claims 4-7, 10, 11, 14, 17-20 and 22-25 are now pending.

Claim 4 incorporates subject matter previously recited in claims 8 and 9. Applicant respectfully submits that the applied references, *Deen* (U.S. 6,629,127), *Gupta* (U.S. 2001/0027492), *McChesney* (U.S. 5,857,102), *Dillingham* (U.S. 6,327,608), *Harrison* (U.S. 6,622,170) and *Nori* (5,999,943), whether taken individually or in any proper combination, cannot support a rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The Examiner concedes that *Deen*, *Gupta* and *McChesney* do not disclose or suggest "a snapshot," as previously recited in claims 8 and 9. (Office Action, p. 6.) *Dillingham* is cited for its alleged teaching of transmitting an HTML page if a container is not identified within an HTTP path name. (Office Action, p. 5.) *Harrison* is cited for purportedly disclosing setting path information to allow policy updates. (Office Action, pp. 6-7.) But *Dillingham* and *Harrison* say nothing with regard to a "snapshot" and the Examiner does not rely on *Dillingham* and *Harrison* for any such disclosure or suggestion. Accordingly, *Deen*, *Gupta*, *McChesney*, *Dillingham* and *Harrison* do not teach or suggest "processing at the server the HTTP path name to retrieve a snapshot of the identified container of the server if the HTTP path name includes the identity of the container, the snapshot representing the content of the identified container at a particular point in time" and "generating at the server from the snapshot a response including the administrative data corresponding to the HTTP path name" (emphasis added), as recited in claim 4. *Nori* does not overcome these deficiencies.

¹ The Office Action contains statements characterizing the claims and related art. Regardless of whether any such statements are specifically addressed herein, Applicant's silence as to these characterizations should not be construed as acceptance of them.

Nori discloses a method and system for improving operations on large objects ("LOBS"). (*Nori*, col. 2:17-33.) According to *Nori*, in reply to a command from a client, a server sends the client a "locator" including a "LOB identifier that uniquely identifies the LOB and snapshot information that identifies the particular version of the LOB." (*Id.*) Based on the locator, the server can perform an operation on a particular version of the LOB identified in the snapshot that was passed by the server to the client. (*Id.*) As such, clients can operate on specified subsets of the LOB and reduce the amount of data that is passed between the server and client. (*Id.* at col. 4:44-67.)

Nori identifies a snapshot of a LOB based on a snapshot-id included in a locator. (*Id.* at col. 6:61-63.) Because the snapshot is identified based on the locator, *Nori* does not disclose or suggest using a "HTTP path name to retrieve a snapshot." Thus, *Nori* also fails to teach or suggest "processing ... the HTTP path name to retrieve a snapshot of the identified container," as recited in claim 4.

As noted above, *Deen, Gupta, McChesney, Dillingham* and *Harrison* say nothing with regard to a "snapshot." The applied documents cannot, therefore, be considered to teach or suggest the subject matter of claim 4 whether they are taken individually or in combination. Thus, *Deen, Gupta, McChesney, Dillingham, Harrison* and *Nori* cannot support a rejection of claim 4 under Section 103.

Claim 11, 18 and 23, although of different scope than claim 4, recites features similar to those recited in claim 4. Accordingly, claims 11, 18 and 23 are allowable for the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 4.

Claims 5-7, 10, 14, 17, 19, 20, 22, 24 and 25 are allowable at least due to their corresponding dependence from claim 4 11, 18 and 23.

Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims.

If additional fees are required for any reason, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-4800 the necessary amount.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC

Date: November 6, 2008

By: /Steven Ashburn/
Steven Ashburn
Registration No. 56,636

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Customer No. 21839